

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JASON R. BRANNIGAN,

Case No. 2:23-cv-00725-JDP (PC)

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

RHEA,

Defendants.

Plaintiff brings this section 1983 case against defendant Rhea, a property officer at the California Medical Facility. He alleges that she violated his rights by losing some of his property during a facility transfer. ECF No. 1 at 3. For the reasons stated below, the complaint does not state a cognizable claim. I will grant plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. ECF No. 2.

Screening Order

I. Screening and Pleading Requirements

A federal court must screen a prisoner's complaint that seeks relief against a governmental entity, officer, or employee. *See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a).* The court must identify any cognizable claims and dismiss any portion of the complaint that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b)(1), (2).*

A complaint must contain a short and plain statement that plaintiff is entitled to relief, Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2), and provide “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face,” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). The plausibility standard does not require detailed allegations, but legal conclusions do not suffice. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). If the allegations “do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct,” the complaint states no claim. *Id.* at 679. The complaint need not identify “a precise legal theory.” *Kobold v. Good Samaritan Reg ’l Med. Ctr.*, 832 F.3d 1024, 1038 (9th Cir. 2016). Instead, what plaintiff must state is a “claim”—a set of “allegations that give rise to an enforceable right to relief.” *Nagrampa v. MailCoups, Inc.*, 469 F.3d 1257, 1264 n.2 (9th Cir. 2006) (en banc) (citations omitted).

The court must construe a pro se litigant’s complaint liberally. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972) (per curiam). The court may dismiss a pro se litigant’s complaint “if it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief.” *Hayes v. Idaho Corr. Ctr.*, 849 F.3d 1204, 1208 (9th Cir. 2017). However, “a liberal interpretation of a civil rights complaint may not supply essential elements of the claim that were not initially pled.” *Bruns v. Nat’l Credit Union Admin.*, 122 F.3d 1251, 1257 (9th Cir. 1997) (*quoting Ivey v. Bd. of Regents*, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)).

1 **II. Analysis**

2 As noted above, plaintiff alleges that defendant Rhea was responsible for the loss of his
3 personal property during a prison transfer. ECF No. 1 at 3. The Supreme Court, however, has
4 held that “an unauthorized intentional deprivation of property by a state employee does not
5 constitute a violation of the procedural requirements of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth
6 Amendment if a meaningful postdeprivation remedy for the loss is available.” *Hudson v. Palmer*,
7 468 U.S. 517, 533 (1984). California provides such a remedy, *see Barnett v. Centoni*, 31 F.3d
8 813, 816-17 (9th Cir. 1994), and plaintiff does not allege that he has availed himself of it.


9 Plaintiff may file an amended complaint that addresses this issue. He is advised that the
10 amended complaint will supersede the current complaint. *See Lacey v. Maricopa County*, 693 F.
11 3d 896, 907 n.1 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc). This means that the amended complaint will need to be
12 complete on its face without reference to the prior pleading. *See* E.D. Cal. Local Rule 220. Once
13 an amended complaint is filed, the current complaint no longer serves any function. Therefore, in
14 an amended complaint, as in an original complaint, plaintiff will need to assert each claim and
15 allege each defendant’s involvement in sufficient detail. The amended complaint should be titled
16 “Amended Complaint” and refer to the appropriate case number.

17 Accordingly, it is ORDERED that:

18 1. Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is GRANTED.
19 2. Within thirty days from the service of this order, plaintiff may file an amended
20 complaint. If he does not, I will recommend this action be dismissed for failure to state a claim.
21 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to send plaintiff a complaint form.

22
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: June 5, 2023

25 
26 JEREMY D. PETERSON
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE